REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of November 18, 2003.

All of the Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants have noted that the drawings submitted with the patent application filed February 2, 2000 were objected to because of the problems addressed in form PTO-948 dated March 28, 2000. Applicants are submitting herewith a new set of replacement drawings correcting the informalities as detailed in the form cited above.

The Office Action

Claims 1-6 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crosby et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,507,848, hereinafter Crosby).

Claims 8-22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bobrow et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,529,285, hereinafter Bobrow).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Crosby and Bobrow.

Comments/Arguments

Applicant has amended claim 1 to more specifically note that an existing page from a network is imported and converted for insertion into a document. Applicant respectfully submits that Crosby does not teach or fairly suggest importing an existing page from a network, translating the existing page into a page description language (PDL) file, translating the PDL file into an image file and inserting the image file into a document. Rather, Crosby teaches a method for creating and displaying dynamic objects in an interactive document, wherein a media editor creates dynamic objects such as buttons, check boxes, text fields, combo boxes and list boxes. A container application can then be utilized by a user to import these dynamic objects into a document. Nowhere in Crosby does it teach or fairly suggest importing an existing page from a network into a printing system.

For at least this reason, it is submitted that claim 1 and dependent claims 2 through 7 distinguish patentability over the prior art.

Claims 8, 20 and 24 have been amended to further define the method of dynamically linking content from a page from a network with a document whereby the page content is automatically updated without further interaction from a user. Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in Bobrow does it teach or fairly suggest a method of dynamically linking content from a page from a network with a document whereby the page content within the document is automatically updated without further user interaction. It is submitted that claims 8, 20 and 24 are now distinguished from cited reference and therefore respective dependent claims 9-12 and 21-22 are distinguished.

Claim 13 has also been amended to specifically emphasize the distinctions as noted in relation to claim 1. Therefore claim 13 including dependent claims 14-19 of claim 13 are submitted as distinguished from the cited art for at least this reason.

New claims 25 and 26 recite language which distinguishes the claims from the cited references.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-23 and 25-26) are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is therefore earnestly solicited.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

3/18/04
Date

N:\XERZ\200531\3A\JRC0000019V001.DOC

8